

countries with whom we have been allied and partnered for so many years now, not only will they suffer, which I can only assume is the intent of the President, but so will we. We also do deep disservice and dishonor to those who have fought so hard, worked so long, and done so much to build up something today that we are the lucky heirs to.

Furthermore, our leadership position in the world is not sustained on blood and treasure and diplomacy alone. It is the values that we live out each and every day in our homes, in our communities, and, yes, here in our government, in the United States Congress. Values that include taking in the world's refugees.

After screening, ensuring the security and safety of the communities into which they will come, which we have always done—and no one is vetted or screened more thoroughly than a refugee from another country trying to enter the United States—most will not be able to make it, even under previous administrations. But after that screening has taken place, when they come to this country, those refugees, those asylum seekers, and those immigrants are the ones who have helped to build this success story, this exceptional country, this indispensable Nation, the United States.

And when we turn off the lamp of liberty, when we no longer shine as a beacon to the refugees, the aspirational people around the world who are looking for a better life, who were called to our shores by our values and what we represent around the world, and what we have always fought for and proved in actions beyond our words, when that lamp goes out, when we begin religious tests for the kinds of immigrants who we will bring into this country, when we do things that are immediately politically popular but are not in the best traditions of this country, we lose that place of prominence around the world, not just to the countries and the decisionmakers within those countries—the kings and queens and presidents and prime ministers—we lose that place of prominence with the people around the world who have always looked to the United States for example and for leadership.

And so I ask my colleagues to join me in ensuring that, as troubling as this course has been in the first few weeks of this administration, we remember that we still have time to correct it and that we have an obligation to offer an alternative, one that has served this country so well for so long and is a source of so much of our strength, our exceptionalism, and our greatness. I call on my colleagues to move beyond Presidential fiat, beyond executive order, beyond the whims of a new administration, and to set in law our values and our priorities.

Ultimately, we must be able to reform our system of immigration laws. But short of that, we must at least be able to honor the ones who are already

on the books. We have to do more to ensure that those who need us most in the world can find a home in this country, not solely for their benefit. That is the moral imperative. That is the argument that can persuade us in our hearts, but also because the value and the benefit will accrue to this country economically in our security, in our vibrancy, and in ensuring that the next generation is going to be the leaders, whether it comes to the businesses that are created, the books and the art that are created, the leadership that is needed, and the service that we demand in uniform throughout the world.

Certainly that comes from native born U.S. citizens, but it also, as we know when we think about the history of this country, that comes from those who came to our shores. Or, like most of the Western Hemisphere, whether your family came from Mexico or El Salvador or Argentina, there is a good chance that your Ellis Island was El Paso, Texas, that your family first set foot on U.S. soil in the community that I have the honor to represent today. Whether it was in Segundo Barria, or the Chihuahueta neighborhood, or the Chamizal district, El Paso has been that first welcoming community to millions who have answered the promise, the potential, the opportunity, and the beacon of hope that we have provided for the world.

It is no accident, and it is totally connected, that El Paso's safety is directly proportional to our connection to the rest of the world, to Mexico, to these people who so many of our political leaders want to sow fear and anxiety and misapprehension about. They want to vilify these people, call them rapists and thugs and criminals, when the facts bear out that they are the very reason that we are so secure and so safe.

So imagine in the Ellis Island of the Western Hemisphere—El Paso, Texas—building a wall that would forever separate and divide us from the rest of the hemisphere, from the place where we meet the rest of the world. That, too, will compromise our leadership position in the world. That, too, will dishonor the noble sacrifice that we have seen from countless servicemembers from those who pursue U.S. policy around the world, and to those who are now serving in more than 140 countries around the globe.

I think about another country and another wall at another time that proved American exceptionalism when the Soviets constructed the Berlin Wall to keep East Germans from being able to flee to the West, those East Germans who, in some way, were responding to the hope that I am talking about that we have so long represented around the world. It was the United States that overcame that wall. It was people like General James H. Polk who ensured that the people of East Berlin had hope, that the people of West Berlin had hope, that we made every effort to fulfill our commitments, not just to

Americans on American soil, but to American values wherever they may be represented around the world. While other governments were building walls, the United States was doing the right thing.

And it was a President of the United States, Ronald Reagan, who challenged the Soviet empire to tear down this wall. How far have we come that today, in 2017, in the living lifetime of those who served with President Reagan, who voted for President Reagan, who lived in the America that President Reagan was a President of, that we are contemplating building a wall that would keep people out, that would separate people who have a common future, a common history? And in places like El Paso and Ciudad Juarez, 3 million people who form the largest binational community in the world, two people who have a common identity, nothing to be afraid of, nothing to be anxious about, nothing to be scared of. We, the United States, are at our best when we are strong, when we are confident, when we are bold. We are at our worst when we are anxious, when we are afraid, when we are scared.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that we not make policy out of fear, that we not stoke anxiety, that we not lose the best, strongest traditions of who we are as Americans, but, instead, follow those traditions. And when we do, we will be able to change the course that this country is now on. We will be able to help this President to do the right thing, the right thing for this country, in this country more importantly, but to do the right thing for this country when it means standing up for our values, our interests, our allies around the world.

Mr. Speaker, for many in this country and for many around the world, these are some of the darkest days in recent memory. But I have hope because we have had far darker days in this country before. And the institutions, such as the one that we are in today, and the American people whose work we do at whose pleasure we serve, who we represent in this Chamber, are a remarkable, resilient people. And they will help to bring this body, this administration, this government, and this country to its senses. And when we get there, I am confident that we are going to do the right thing, I am confident that we are going to honor the best traditions of this country, we are going to honor the brave men and women who have served, who helped to build what we have today, which so many people take for granted. Mr. Speaker, I am confident that working together, Republican and Democrat, we are going to do what is best for the world and what is best for America.

I yield back the balance of my time.

SECURITY AND GENEROSITY: ON BEING AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. COMSTOCK). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the

Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY) for 30 minutes.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Madam Speaker, if the gentleman from Texas (Mr. O'ROURKE) would mind lingering in the Chamber for just a moment, I want to make a couple of comments on what he said. Because he began his talk with a commemoration of some extraordinary Americans, World War II veterans. And as I was waiting my turn to speak, I couldn't help but reflect upon perhaps one of the most extraordinary opportunities that I have been given as a Member of the House of Representatives.

A bipartisan delegation went to the 70th anniversary of the D-day invasion. President Obama, of course, spoke, and dignitaries from around the world, including the Queen of England, also made an appearance.

When we got to the cemetery area at Omaha Beach, we were meeting veterans who had fought there or in the vicinity. One of the first gentlemen I met, he had only a thumb, and he was sitting in a wheelchair. And I just asked him, because it was such a celebratory atmosphere and everyone was so engaged by the heroism of these men and the opportunity to be back so many years later—I just asked him: Did that happen here?

He said: Yeah, right over there on the beach.

Well, his daughter was with him, and she told me a moment later: Actually, what happened was we think that he was shot on the hip and one of his grenades began to go off and he was throwing it away from himself.

I looked at him and I said: How are you here?

And he said: I don't know.

Another man had been a part of the paratroopers who dropped in behind enemy lines the night before near the town of Sainte-Mere-Eglise, and I will come to that town in a moment. And I asked him: What was your assignment?

He said: Hill 60, or some number.

And I said: Where is that?

He said: Right over there. He said: Guard the bridge at La Fiere.

I said: That is the bridge at La Fiere.

An old Norman-style, arched stone bridge, maybe a car-length wide, obviously just one lane to get a horse and cart over.

He said: Do not let the Germans cross that bridge, that was our assignment, and we held them.

Another man looked at me and said: I haven't been here in 70 years. A much better reception this time.

This great humor, this depth of character that these extraordinary men showed was so evident that day.

□ 2045

To continue the story a little bit more, Captain Luther Sextan Fortenberry, my grandfather, left his family in August of 1944. He was a medical doctor and was initially at a hospital in England. The records are a little bit unclear; but, in November of '44, he was

killed, and he left his 8-year-old son—my father—behind. He was initially buried at Sainte-Mere-Eglise, at the cemetery there. He was reinterred in Arlington National Cemetery.

One of the guides that we had during that trip was a former British military officer, and he had a complete command of the details of the battle. In fact, I was so impressed by him that I invited him to come to Nebraska to speak to my veterans, and he accepted. So, later that summer, we hosted him in Nebraska. One of my little towns is called Columbus, Nebraska. Columbus is actually the place where Andrew Jackson Higgins was born—the Higgins boat inventor, which was the troop carrier that landed there on Omaha and Utah Beaches that day. President Eisenhower said of Andrew Jackson Higgins that he won the war for us.

He is very much associated with Louisiana because that is where he spent his adulthood, in shipbuilding, and he would not let go of the idea that we needed this innovative type of troop carrier. He is from Columbus, Nebraska. In the front of Columbus, Nebraska—which is a small, agricultural town, a wonderful community of 25,000 people—they have built an extraordinary World War II memorial that is a replica of the Higgins boat, with beautiful bronze sculptures of the troops in their charging off that boat.

When my friend, the former British military officer who now does—again—tours and commentary on the battle, saw this, he looked at me and said: JEFF, this belongs on Utah Beach because there is nothing like that there anymore.

I will make a long story short.

Some of the members of the community who had worked on that project heard this. They said: Well, we can build another one.

I was trying to tamp down expectations because I knew how difficult that would be; but the day before the 71st anniversary, that new World War II memorial was put in the breach where our troops first came through, where General Roosevelt led our troops through on Utah Beach. Right in the breach, a memorial that was constructed by the good people of Columbus, Nebraska, now sits as a permanent display—a replica—of the Higgins boat, right next to the World War II museum right there on Utah Beach. I understand it is extraordinarily popular as one is able to enter onto the boat and experience the life-like reality of what it must have been like to be in that moment. The French even moved one of their own monuments, by the way. This is the cooperation we had with the French Government. They moved their own monument to General Le Clerc—their general who had followed the pathway or fought, as well, into Germany.

I apologize for holding the gentleman up, but he talked about a number of things. Obviously, we are going to have big, important debates about a number

of the sensitive points he talked about; but where there is no debate is in the character of the men and women who served in World War II. I thank the gentleman so much.

Madam Speaker, I want to give this commentary tonight, as well, on some of the dynamics of the moment. Before I begin, I would like to share with you that, outside of my office, there hangs a framed copy of a piece of legislation. In fact, it was one of the earliest pieces of legislation that I worked on here, and I am quite proud of it. The bill increased the number of Iraqi translators who could come to the United States. These persons served alongside our troops and put themselves and their families at great personal risk in service to our country. Among those who benefited from this expanded policy were members of the Yazidi faith tradition—a peaceful, ancient faith—that, very sadly, ISIS has targeted as a part of its extermination campaign against Christians and other religious minorities, including innocent Muslim communities.

Madam Speaker, as we all know, America has long opened her arms to persons who flee persecution, who wish to rebuild their lives and become good citizens here. My hometown of Lincoln, Nebraska, is a diverse, welcoming community with a number of first-generation Americans, and we are the better for it. However, when there is chaos and disorder at our border or if there is uncertainty in immigration policy and procedures, this problem undermines the ability of our country to be generous; or, worse, it affects our safety. There are two principles being held in the balance here: keeping America safe and keeping America generous.

President Trump's executive order to protect the Nation from foreign terrorist entry into the United States has suspended all new refugee admissions into the U.S. for 120 days. In addition, it blocks all travelers for 90 days from seven countries of concern—Iraq, Iran, Libya, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, and Yemen—which was a list, by the way, created by the Obama administration in 2015. Refugees from Syria are banned indefinitely, and travelers from these countries with a green card will be allowed since they are permanent United States residents.

Madam Speaker, from my perspective, I believe it is reasonable to pause and review our refugee policy from dangerous parts of the world; but, clearly, the implementation of the policy has caused some confusion, difficulty, and concern, some of which has been clarified.

As an example, there is a Yazidi man named Nawaf, who was one of those military translators—again, putting himself at great risk to serve alongside our troops. Nawaf visited my office last Monday. It was in the evening. He requested help for his wife, Laila. Two of his brothers live where I live—in Lincoln, Nebraska. Although I didn't recognize him at first, I remembered that

a president of a university in Iraq, whom I know, once told me about a Yazidi student who had become class valedictorian of that university; so I began to piece this story together.

Nawaf arrived in America just last year. Following 18 months of vetting, his wife was awarded a special visa about a week and a half ago; but as Nawaf was explaining to me both with great composure and, frankly, a certain sensitivity to our security concerns, he told me that his wife, Laila, was barred from entry.

Madam Speaker, immigration and refugee policy always involves a difficult choice. A country has to consider first its absorption capacity, the possibilities of assimilation, as well as the necessity of those coming to accept the values of the host country's. I think a review of this policy or of these principles—a review of what has happened in Europe—actually sheds some light.

For example, Germany recklessly threw open its borders recently, and a wave of persons—many young, single men—entered the country, sparking an uptick in crime and violence and, possibly, the conditions for more terrorist attacks. Confusion continues as to who is where, and the German Government's rapidly considered and naive refugee policy has unwittingly created an anti-immigration backlash and political turmoil.

Madam Speaker, the immigration and refugee movement should always be a means of last resort. Everyone can't come to the West. Rather, it is the responsibility of governments around the world to create the conditions in which people can live securely. If that breaks down, as a first order response, robust humanitarian assistance and repositioning persons in nearby safe zones creates the possibility of a right of return and avoids the trauma of uprooting persons from their homes and their cultures.

Madam Speaker, with all of the complex considerations surrounding immigration, though, it is important to remember that we are not dealing with statistics, that we are not dealing with some remote geopolitical policy, but that we are dealing with the lives of real persons. So, happily, last Friday morning, after my office successfully worked on the case, Laila arrived, and with open arms and flowers, Nawaf, her husband, welcomed her to America.

Madam Speaker, given now that the executive order has been put on a temporary halt as the administration goes through the appeals process, I also think it is appropriate to pause and speak about the broader issues at stake here—what it means to be a nation and what it means to have a binding narrative as a people.

Madam Speaker, I am quite sure our soldiers know this feeling all too well—I have experienced it. Perhaps you have experienced it, too—when you are in a far-off place, with no one familiar around you, and then you, all of a sudden, have that feeling of connection be-

cause you see it—you see an American flag. At that moment, the flag is more than a piece of cloth with stars and stripes. It is an enduring symbol that expresses a deep, unspoken narrative about who we are as a people and about the ideals that unite us as a nation.

If you ask most people what America means, I would suggest that they would probably use one word: freedom. Yet I am afraid, Madam Speaker, that this word "freedom" is so overused that we have forgotten its essential meaning. Most properly understood, freedom is the ability to do what one ought—to take responsibility for oneself, one's family, one's community, and, by extension, one's nation. Freedom is not a detachment from responsibility to do whatever you want. That is a self-destructive idea that erodes freedom, resulting not only in the loss of oneself, but in the degradation of the entire community.

Of course, we often reflect on what it means to be an American when discussing immigration. America has long offered the hope of freedom for immigrants who are yearning to work for a better future for themselves, for their families. To those tempest-tossed, to those tired, poor, huddled masses yearning to breathe free, America has lifted its lamp beside the golden door. Implicit in this worldwide welcome was a basic compact that those who came here, however arduous their journey, must undertake the responsibility of citizenship. Of course, many people gleefully do.

In fact, America's very survival as a beacon-handed land requires those who immigrate to assimilate and adopt the values proposition that makes our country unique in the history of the world. Those values include respect for others, the acceptance of law and order as a prerequisite for the orderly functioning of society, and the desire to participate constructively as a citizen. Those who refuse to assimilate or reject these time-honored values take advantage of the sacrifices and hard-fought gains of generations of Americans who have built and often died for what we cherish and what we so eagerly share with people from around the world. That is fundamentally unfair and is an abuse of the idea of freedom itself.

Madam Speaker, individual freedom is achieved most fully in the context of community. When the government or interest groups see freedom merely as a functional meeting of material needs alone, it undermines the social dimensions of freedom, which are rooted in authentic human relationships.

□ 2100

Conversely, the proper amount of government, a government well-ordered, provides protection and creates the guardrails for individuals to flourish together, generating meaning for persons and community. The right political approach in America can restore that golden mean.

Madam Speaker, there is a story I would like to tell. There is a man, and he is talking to his young son. He said: Son, you see that beautiful, lovely home there on the hill? One day, if it is your heart's desire, if you are willing to work hard and be patient, and if you do what is right, then maybe you could earn that home one day.

Another man in another country took a very different approach talking to his young son. He said: See that big mansion on the hill there? If you work hard enough, if you stay focused, and if you position yourself right, one day you can get that guy.

You see, Madam Speaker, our country is not based on the principle of envy. It is based on respect and responsibility. To make America flourish again, politically, economically, and culturally, a restoration of this ideal is necessary to create the conditions for a true and lasting freedom.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. POE of Texas (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of personal reasons.

Mr. JEFFRIES (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

PUBLICATION OF COMMITTEE RULES

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS
FOR THE 115TH CONGRESS

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 1, 2017.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN: Enclosed herewith are the Rules and Procedures for the 115th Congress that were adopted by the Committee on Small Business at its organizational meeting on February 1, 2017.

Sincerely,

STEVE CHABOT,
Chairman.

1. GENERAL PROVISIONS

(A) Rules of the Committee. The Rules of the House of Representatives, in total (but especially with respect to the operations of committee., Rule X, cl. 1(q), cl. 2, cl. 3(1) and Rule XI), are the rules of the Committee on Small Business ("Committee") to the extent applicable and are incorporated by reference.

(B) Appointments by the Chair. Pursuant to the Rules of the House, the Chair shall designate a Member of the Committee Majority to serve as Vice Chair of the Committee. The Vice Chair shall preside at any meeting or hearing during the temporary absence of the Chair. The Chair also reserves the right to designate a Member of the Committee Majority to serve as the Chair at a hearing or meeting.

2. REFERRAL OF BILLS BY THE CHAIR

The Chair will retain consideration of all legislation referred to the Committee by the Speaker. No action will be required of a Subcommittee before legislation is considered for report by the Committee. Subcommittee chairs, pursuant to the rules set out herein,